

ARIZONA PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Summary of Minutes
October 23, 2007

Voting Members Present:

David Felix, Deputy Director, Arizona Department of Public Safety (Chairman)
Marcus Aurelius, Emergency Management
Michael Brashier, Communications Manager, City of Casa Grande
Amy Brooks, Captain, Apache Junction Fire Department
Jan Hauk, Past President, Arizona Fire District Association Representative
Tracy Montgomery, Assistant Chief, Phoenix Police Department
Leesa Morrison, Director, Arizona Department of Homeland Security
Kathleen Robinson, Assistant Chief, Tucson Police Department
Danny Sharp, Chief, Oro Valley Police Department
Dan Wills, Battalion Chief, Sedona Fire District
Dewayne Woodie, Fire Chief, Ganado Fire District/EMS

Voting Members Absent:

Ray Allen, Assistant Chief, Tucson Fire Department
Hal Collett, Sheriff, La Paz County/Arizona Sheriff's Association
Dora Schriro, Director, Arizona Department of Corrections
Mike Worrell, Captain, Phoenix Fire Department

PSCC Support Office Attendees:

Curt Knight, Executive Director, Public Safety Communications Commission
Jeff Miner, Project Manager, Public Safety Communications Commission
Wayne Kincheloe, Engineer II, Public Safety Communications Commission
Renee Larson, Administrative Services Officer, Public Safety Communications Commission
Evelyn Jablonski, Executive Assistant, Public Safety Communications Commission

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. by Chairman David Felix. Roll call was taken by Ms. Evelyn Jablonski as noted above and a quorum was declared present.

Approval of Minutes from September 25, 2007

Chairman Felix called for a motion to approve the September 25, 2007 minutes. Mr. Curt Knight advised draft minutes were not yet completed but would be emailed to the commissioners by November 2. He also advised we would attempt to summarize the minutes more and perhaps that would speed up the turnaround. Chairman Felix then called for a motion to table the September 25, 2007 minutes until the next meeting. Commissioner Dan Wills made the first motion; Commissioner Danny Sharp seconded and motion was carried unanimously.

Overview of the Development and Current Status of the Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) Grant

Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP)

Mr. John Murray gave a brief status review on the eight major components of the SCIP, plan progress, information still needed, where we stand today, investment justifications and next steps.

He reported the major components of the SCIP have been compiled and written following the federal Department of Homeland Security guidance requirements and collection of information from various sources with several draft reviews already taken place. As the SCIP now stands, federal Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has identified gaps in the SCIP as listed below; however, gaps were not found in many sections. Their review is not intended to sanction or give approval but only to serve as direction. These sections were flagged as requiring additional work: 1) major transit interoperability, 2) interstate and international coordination, 3) local, federal, tribal, and non-governmental input, 4) outreach, 5) governance, 6) migration plan, 7) statewide SOPs, 8) background information, 9) funding, 10) measuring progress, and 11) statewide training.

He reported the next major version of the SCIP will be distributed on approximately November 12 for the Commission's review and feedback, followed by final approval and submittal of the SCIP and supporting investment justifications being achieved at our November 20 meeting, and then final submission to DHS by December 3, 2007.

Investment Justifications (IJ's)

Mr. Murray provided an overview on the five investment justifications (IJs) and their established requirements (multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional, advanced technology, improved spectrum efficiency, cost effective in providing operability/interoperability, all hazards solutions, and improved coverage). The SCIP is inclusive of a strategic technology reserve (STR) component which will be taken off the top of the allocated funding.

Grant Application Workbook

Mr. Murray reported application workbooks have been sent out and are due back to Department of Homeland Security by 5:00 pm on October 28, 2007. He reported another set of guidelines have been received from DHS and National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) which changed the format and allowed for expanded fields in the workbook.

He reported once submittals are received a 3-step evaluation process will take place first by the Interoperability Working Group (IWG), followed by a review from the Regional Advisory Councils, and ultimately final approval by the Arizona Department of Homeland Security.

He indicated a key review by federal DHS will be to see how the IJs support the findings in the SCIP as well as vice versa for cross reference back to the IJs.

He expressed his appreciation to the extended project team for their efforts on working the SCIP in such a short timeframe and for the great job they've done in putting this all together.

No questions or comments arose from the Commission.

Statewide Communications Interoperable Plan (SCIP) Review

Overview/Propose Changes/Approval of the Plan Status/Review and Approval of Plan Timeline for Completion

Ms. Lisa Meyerson provided a summary status of the draft SCIP.

Ms. Meyerson called on the locals to continue to feed information to us and review the SCIP, as well as provide more information pertaining to their local projects.

Governance is still an area of concern and the weakest part of the SCIP from an operational capacity, i.e., who decides the costs, who pays and what amount, etc. Without a governance structure in place, a “plan for a plan” will be written. This is permitted by federal DHS and will be in the next draft SCIP for your review. It has been determined it will take 1 – 1 ½ years to come up with a sound governance structure. As per feedback from the Interoperable Communications Technical Assistance Program (ICTAP), many states will have a “plan for a plan” versus a detailed operational governance structure.

Ms. Meyerson reported the Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) contractor did an initial review of the SCIP with those edits incorporated and will be conducting another detailed edit in the next couple of weeks with Federal Engineering as the lead contractor either accepting or rejecting their recommended edits. Once those edits are processed, another draft SCIP will be submitted to the Commission approximately November 12 for their review. This is in anticipation of an approval at the next PSCC meeting on November 20 for submission to DHS by November 30 to meet the December 3, 2007 deadline of the final SCIP.

Chairman Felix reminded the Commission of the initial study on different options for governance submitted by Deputy Chief Kermit Miller, co-chair of the Governance Committee. He proposed having a facilitator possibly funded by the PSCC to bring a group together to establish a governance structure. He proposed this group begin to build the framework and start having discussions. His thoughts were to hire someone to facilitate those discussions, conduct statewide meetings/hearings, gain agency/public input and eventually come up with a concrete plan for a governance structure.

Commissioner Danny Sharp felt we needed to begin the process for finding a consultant and not wait until after Super Bowl. He questioned if we needed something from the Commission or direction to staff to begin the task of finding someone to take on the governance issue. He expressed it would be beneficial to have some background governance information prior to meeting about it since he is unfamiliar with this subject. Commissioner Dan Wills agreed.

Mr. Knight stated he had kept the names of some contractors who he felt might be possible contenders for this type of work. He advised he would renew those contacts with those individuals and begin looking at a contractual approach for someone to help facilitate and feed the process of a governance framework and keep it moving forward. Chairman Felix’s desire was to have someone selected and ready to begin around Super Bowl or post Super Bowl timeframe, select committee members to work on this and have it ready to go for further

discussions by the Commission. His direction to staff was to begin the process of identifying a contractor to have them onboard in the next 60 days.

Mr. Knight questioned if Chairman Felix was suggesting a subcommittee from the Commission to be able to assist in or participate in the review in the suggested 60-day timeframe. Chairman Felix advised we could do that if the need was there. Commissioner Sharp volunteered as did Chairman Felix for this process. Mr. Knight advised we would try and schedule a briefing at the November 20 meeting of what was found and available to us.

Ms. Meyerson provided the following summary status on the investment justifications. Investment justifications have gone through several reviews and will tie into the application workbooks in terms of the projects being submitted. She advised the team is going to be very actively involved in the review and decision process of what those projects will be. She was hoping final important SCIP comments would be done quickly when the next draft is sent out to allow more work to be devoted to the investment justifications.

Ms. Meyerson advised information on how the \$17.7 million would be spent, governance and project management will need to be described in great detail for DHS. It was her understanding IJs would be approved one by one; however, money would not be released under that specific IJ until money needed to be spent and there were matching funds. They are hoping to have IJs to the Commission early before November 20 but expressed timeframe may be shorter than SCIP turnaround. She is requesting comments on SCIP be provided in a timely manner as IJ review will follow soon after.

Chairman Felix thanked the state team for all the work they have done.

Project 25 Inter Subsystem Interface (ISSI) Standards – Overview & Current Status

Mr. John Murray, Federal Engineering, briefed the Commission on the Project 25 Inter Subsystem Interface (ISSI) standard providing an overview of the ISSI history, current features, diagram illustration of (interconnecting networks, coverage extension, and agency interoperability roaming when authorized), scope definitions, documentation status, and important considerations for planning.

He mentioned the Project 25 ISSI standard is still in the development stages and allows multiple Project 25 systems the capability of interconnecting to talk with one another without having to go through console patches and/or internet protocol gateways.

He advised some important considerations for ISSI implementation include 1) upgrades to your existing system with current version technology (hardware, firmware, and software), 2) takes time to become fully ISSI compliant, 3) vendor community approaches for implementation may vary, 4) involves complex networking/provisioning issues, 5) technology is still evolving so additional features and capabilities may still be undefined, and 6) thorough planning for design, investment, and implementation should be given.

The question of the ISSI standard being available for the demonstration project was asked. Mr. Murray stated it was anticipated that a vendor specific intersystem interface would be used which is different from the ISSI standard currently under development.

Commissioner Dan Wills expressed in contemplating these potentially huge dollar-size projects throughout the state he hoped we would not be put in a proprietary environment and to also ensure the flexibility of the community of system users. He emphasized the need to stay closely aligned with the progress of the standards before proceeding into any bidding or procurement contract.

Mr. Murray reported the Project 25 governing body is made up of public and private entities with representatives from state, local, and federal governments who are involved in public safety communications, as well as all the major vendors. The group meets periodically with their next meeting scheduled for January in Mesa.

Status and Update Regarding Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Funding for Interoperability Infrastructure

Mr. Knight invited Mr. Alan Hansen, Transportation Engineer, Federal Highway Administration to speak to the Commission on the possible utilization of federal highway funds for interoperable communications infrastructure due to a change in the federal statute which allows a certain percentage of these funds be used for this purpose.

Mr. Hansen advised Arizona receives approximately \$600 million a year from 18 cents/gallon being set aside when we fill up our gas tank which ultimately goes into this federal highway trust fund. He provided a brief summarization of the different Arizona projects that have utilized these monies, i.e., Computer-aided Dispatch data sharing, ER-link, fiber interconnect, regional communications networks, and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) research.

Mr. Hansen shared the latter of these examples, ADOT research, was used to fund a radio interoperability study between ADOT and the Department of Public Safety.

Mr. Hansen expressed these funds are used very little in other states and he believes Arizona is a leader in some of the projects that have taken place between transportation and public safety. He advised use of these funds should be related to projects pertaining to transportation, i.e., traffic incident management, emergency management, and telecommunications to link systems for improvement of transportation and public safety services.

He advised their federal funding is on a five-year cycle and is currently working on funds for 2013. To be involved in the funding process, he urged involvement in committees at the state, metropolitan, and council government level and via other means such as national solicitations or earmarks.

Chairman Felix advised when opportunities for funding arise the Commission needs to have a discussion on how we can mutually benefit through a coordinated effort and then have staff research further to take advantage of these monies. Chairman Felix and Mr. Knight expressed their appreciation to Mr. Hansen for his presentation.

Date, Time and Location of Next Meeting

November 20, 2007, 1:00 p.m.

House of Representatives (House Hearing Room 3)

1700 West Washington

Phoenix, Arizona

Mr. Knight indicated the next SIEC/PSCC meeting in November was changed from the 13th to the 20th.

Call to the Public

No comments or questions arose.

Recommendations for Future Meetings

Chairman Felix advised relative to the SCIP plan as feedback and input are solicited, please take the time to review and provide your recommendations and comments to the PSCC Support Office in a timely fashion. In addition, he encouraged suggestions for future agendas/meetings be sent directly to Mr. Knight.

Adjournment

Chairman Felix called for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Danny Sharp moved to adjourn with second motion made by Commissioner Dewayne Woodie. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 2:25 pm.